

## **MTEC Meeting Minutes**

May 6, 2005  
9 AM – 3:30 PM  
Capitol Plaza Hotel  
Jefferson City, MO

### **Attendees**

Council Members: Garland Barton, Gloria Carter-Hicks, J.C. Caudle, Lew Chartock, Denise Cross, Tom Deuschle, Jim Dickerson, Nancy Headrick, Herb Johnson, Gil Kennon, Virginia Mee, Mary V. Moore Johnson, Jerald Pelker, Ron Randen, Greg Steinhoff, Bill Treece, Deb Vandevender, John Wittstruck, Brenda Wrench.

Staff: Rose Marie Hopkins, Mary McKinney, Glenda Terrill.

Other Attendees: Traci Albertson-DWD, Roger Baugher-DWD, Ken Boyer-Southeast WIB, Mary Bruton-MERIC, Steve Coffman-DESE, Randy Cottrell-DWD, Amy Deem-DWD, Clinton Flowers-DWD, Rex Hall-Coffey Communications, Anita Henry-DWD, Jim Houchen-West Central WIB, Franciena King-MERIC, Virginia Kirkpatrick-St. Louis County WIB, Steve Kraus-DWD, Steve Long-STLCC, Brenda Mahr-Employment Connection, Amy Miller-MERIC, Jaydean Miller-Ozark Region, Michael Mills-DED, Dave Peters-MERIC, Juanita Reynolds-DWD, Marty Romitti-MERIC, Sue Sieg-DWD, Timothy Smith-MERIC, Becky Steele-Northwest WIB, Larry Swindle-Southeast WIB, Bob Wilson-DOL, Melissa Woltkamp-DWD.

### **Call to Order**

Dr. Lewis Chartock, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order. He announced that the agenda would be modified due to the danger of losing the quorum later in the meeting.

Dr. Headrick moved to approve the minutes of the January 21 meeting. Mr. Dickerson seconded. Motion passed.

### **State Plan 2005**

Clinton Flowers led the presentation of the Missouri State Workforce Investment Plan to the council with assistance from Anita Henry and Sue Sieg. After reviewing the process under which the plan was developed, they explained this plan coincides with Governor Blunt's priorities to make Missouri business-friendly with demand driven objectives, better educated with a skilled workforce, while encouraging greater administrative efficiencies. A copy of the proposed plan was provided to each MTEC member. Mention was also made of Governor Blunt's Government Reform Committee and the Missouri Quality Jobs Act.

There were several changes in the state plan described in greater detail including local plan development and performance negotiation.

Gil Kennon requested a presentation of the Quality Jobs Act at the next meeting. He explained this legislation is intricate and complicated but important to be understood by the council.

Jim Dickerson suggested the 11 recommendations from the State of the Workforce Report be added on page 7 under the section titled “State Workforce Investment Priorities.” That modification will be made.

Dr. Chartock explained that the council’s role is to recommend this plan to Governor Blunt.

Roger Baugher further described the process including public comment. The Governor must submit Missouri’s plan to United States Department of Labor (USDOL) by May 31. The draft was posted for public comment May 1 to provide the 30 days required for public comment. The MTEC Executive Committee had already indicated that if any comments were substantive enough to require modification, then the plan would need to come back to the council after June 3.

Jim Dickerson requested that the comments of substance be forwarded to the Executive Committee to be reviewed. Mr. Baugher stated the plan had been out for public comment for six days with three requests for a copy of the plan received to date.

John Wittstruck reinforced that the motion to recommend the plan include Mr. Dickerson’s recommendation that the MTEC State of the Workforce recommendations be included on page 7.

Herb Johnson moved that the council will adopt the state plan subject to receiving public comments and that the Executive Committee is authorized to act for the council should any substantive comments be received. John Wittstruck seconded. The motion carried. This plan will now be forwarded to Governor Blunt. If he approves, he will submit it to the USDOL as required by the Workforce Investment Act.

### **New Members**

Greg Steinhoff, Tom Deuschle, and Rose Marie Hopkins each spoke briefly to the council. Dr. Chartock welcomed Gloria Carter-Hicks and John “Gil” Kennon as new members of the council.

### **Old Members**

Dr. Chartock presented a plaque to William Treece in recognition of his years of service to the council.

### **MTEC Overview**

Steve Kraus described the relationship of MTEC to economic development. He explained the scope of the council over the last number of years has been that of a policy body. Normally, MTEC focuses on system-wide issues but the state plan causes MTEC to delve into the minutia. This is not an attempt to keep information from the council but to keep from derailing the group from its high level policy function. He reinforced that being without an executive director or a division director somewhat hampered the interaction to learn what other states are doing in these areas. He reiterated that Missouri is in a much better position in working closely with the business sector and professionals in the business

community such as economic developers to ensure a more thorough understanding. Mr. Kraus also made note that the Missouri Economic Research and Information Center (MERIC) provides good support and is making a good connection between the workforce system and economic developers.

Jim Dickerson continued this discussion to review MTEC's past, present and future. He explained that at one point, MTEC was the example of what local boards were asked not to be in that MTEC tried to be micro-managers. He related a past meeting where the entire time was spent worrying about whether the local boards were spending their money. Then there was concern about what they spent it on. He cautioned that if MTEC concentrates on the minutia then the broad picture is not being addressed. Mr. Dickerson posed the question that if Greg Steinhoff or someone else goes out to attract a business to the State of Missouri, does Missouri's workforce provide the necessary services to seriously make the claim that Missouri either has the workforce or Missouri has the ability to quickly get the workforce that may be needed in their business. As a result of these changes in thinking and innovative mentality, Missouri was accepted as one of six states into the National Governor's Association Policy Academy (NGA).

Ron Randen described his unique perspective as having been an employer and now working with employers. He related that he constantly hears Missouri lacks the workforce but yet community groups claim to have 5,000 available to work. The issue is how come we can't get them jobs? Mr. Randen concurs there are probably 5,000 people ready to work but not at the level where they can go to work. Mr. Randen explained there were six states accepted into NGA's effort with the understanding these were the states that were going to spearhead certain ideals for the rest of the nation. In addition to Missouri, Idaho, Montana, Virginia, Ohio and New Jersey were selected. This has required networking with those states to find out what they were doing and learning about their best practices. With the help of quality consultants, the six states reviewed ideas and customized them for what Missouri thought Missouri's needs were. This required extensive refining. Mr. Randen explained this gave MTEC a foundation to work from.

Dr. Chartock related that employers say Missouri doesn't have prepared workers, so that caused an additional state plan to be passed for education. In his particular WIB, they find that the WIB tends to be an employment agency for people out of work, to a certain degree. There are many other things accomplished in the local WIBs in terms of getting people into education etc., but the people on the ground level are dealing with people who have been under-educated, and don't have the wherewithal to fit into requirements for more science and math. He stated that there seems to be a disconnect between those two things and questioned what's going to happen. There are economic reasons why certain kids are not going to make it. Through WIBs, MTEC needs to try to use best practices to provide the best labor force to employers as can be done, with a mission for getting people who don't have jobs into jobs.

Mr. Randen responded that blame cannot be entirely directed at educators. His personal opinion is that the buck stops at home. He is convinced that family relationships teaching values must be taught at home. There are some things schools just can't bring to the table. He gave the example where in some areas, 50% of the population lacks a high school education, which means discussions about technology will not be relevant. His suggestion was to make sure there are good standards in the high school and grade school, but at the same time, go back to help the ones that didn't make it.

Nancy Headrick reported on the statewide regional meetings of the High School Task Force just completed. She reminded the council that at the January meeting, Dr. Jerry Valentine explained about

this task force appointed by Commissioner of Education Kent King. The four recommendations presented to the state board of education two weeks ago are:

1. Increase graduation requirements from 22 units to 24 units. Increase communication arts to 4 credits and increase math, science and social studies to 3 credits each.
2. Personal finance competencies are to be embedded into the curriculum, perhaps by requiring ½ unit of credit.
3. Use of a national norm assessment along with Missouri add-ons to replace the current high school MAP assessment. ACT was mentioned as an option.
4. A differentiated diploma where students would receive one type of diploma if they earned 24 units of credit and a different diploma following some other criteria.

Clearly, attendance is important. Employers complain because a student doesn't get to work on time and has poor attendance but yet employers fail to review transcripts or neglect to ask what the employee's attendance history was. She explained that if that's an issue, then business, industry and labor need to send high school and college kids a message that attendance is important.

Dr. Headrick challenged the council that if it really wants to do something to impact the workforce and economic development of the state, then MTEC must determine how to communicate a message to high school students. Students must understand that a good high school education will take them on to post-secondary education without remediation which is critically important in today's economy.

Dr. Headrick also explained that Commissioner King continues to have a smaller group of the task force focusing on reforming a set of high school principles.

The first recommendation regarding the change of high school requirement is expected to go to the State Board of Education again in June. She explained there would be a 30-day comment period starting about August, with an expected final order of rulemaking back to the State Board in October.

Dr. Headrick explained that schools were assured there will be flexibility. The emphasis of math and science in its rigor and relevance is not going to go away. She used the example of being in high school over 30 years ago and how the brick and mortar of high schools then have changed little but there are significant changes in technology.

Mr. Dickerson explained that presentations were made to some local school boards with some of the same reaction that it is considered to be unaffordable. To continue on with Mr. Randen's comments regarding the Policy Academy, they had seen presentations from national economists talking about workforce issues relative to the numbers of scientists and mathematicians ready and waiting in places like China and India. He reinforced that Missouri doesn't have a choice to have a strong economic future. Improving attendance and getting employers to look at transcripts is important, but he stated that it is to be very strongly considered because it provides that extra incentive for the student. It will teach that high school student why that grade might be important because if nobody ever asks about the grade, then the student gets an ambivalent attitude.

Larry Swindle stated that he attended the hearing in Southeast Missouri and some of the concerns there were about extended bus rides and who was going to provide the money for more math classes, more science classes, etc.

John Wittstruck said that the purpose of the academy was for creating the next generation of workforce development policy, not about best practices for customer satisfaction or how best to follow-up on people that have been served through the system. The purpose was to determine policies for states to build the workforce of the future. It emphasized that if a state is going to have a meaningful workforce development policy, then it cannot expect workforce development to solely be done by the United States Department of Labor's programs. In addition to a strong elementary system, there must be a more rigorous secondary education program well articulated with our post-secondary programs. Dr. Wittstruck explained that Missouri had to start looking at not so much what schools were doing, but how they were doing it. He recognized the challenges small schools in Southeast Missouri have, but unless those local school boards figure out how to respond to these kinds of challenges that are particularly significant in Southeast, then those kids are not going to have jobs. He reinforced that the cost of adding a new course does not equate to having a teacher in this day and age. It is important to think about the core functions schools and colleges need to be performing and how to adequately finance those things. The investment in human capital is very important but that investment can take a lot of forms that don't necessarily mean more money but perhaps an important look at how that money is spent.

Virginia Mee raised issues relating to adults returning to school due to economic necessity. From her experience, the state needs to connect adults who were successful in the school system to the importance of technical skills. In representing the continuing education department at Drury University, she shared that the age of the typical student is now 28-50. She credits this with the need for continuing education in a technology economy. She related examples of on-line learning and satellite campuses. Drury's largest growing campus by percentage is at Thayer, which is an example of students who would not be able to come to a traditional campus setting. She encouraged finding a way to continue support of those engaged in training, not only concentrating on those at the poverty level.

Dr. Wittstruck reinforced Ms. Mee's comments in that 48%, or 90,000 individuals in Missouri public four- and two-year institutions are part-time students over 25 enrolled in non-degree programs in an effort to help them advance their employment. He suggested a real need for financial aid for them, such as a grant available through the local career center for tuition for one or two courses.

Mr. Dickerson led this discussion to recommendations in the state of the workforce report with strong encouragement to be ready to provide leadership necessary to implement the plan.

Herb Johnson added a statistic of which he was aware that 34% of graduates from four-year institutions have to return to technical school of some sort in order to gain employment.

### **Other Business**

In response to Dr. Chartock's question for other issues to discuss, Dr. Wittstruck requested that Ms. Hopkins develop a proposal of committee structure for the council. Dr. Chartock concurred.

Ms. Hopkins announced there were quite a few expired terms on the council now with more to expire in August. Current members interested in reappointment were directed to submit a resume to be forwarded to the Governor's office. She also requested that those not interested in reappointment to notify her. In addition, she asked for suggestions for potential nominees.

In response to Dr. Chartock's question about how much prior to the expiration of the term, Ms. Hopkins suggested, for the August 2006 people, January to March 2006 would allow adequate time.

Mary Moore Johnson questioned the possibility of the council being reduced in size in support of efficiency. Ms. Hopkins explained the composition of the body is already established and described the importance of maintaining the balance of members.

Bob Wilson followed up to explain how the council could potentially change. He said there is not a mandated size or number for the council. There is a range of folks/agencies to be represented. Under the old JTPA, there was a mandated group to be on the council and MTEC was developed under that criteria. The Workforce Investment Act in 1998 established a different structure requiring 51% business, which made state councils and local boards larger than they had been under JTPA. MTEC will stay structured as is unless the reauthorization will not allow a grandfathered council and mandates something different. If changes are made, then MTEC will have to go to the current WIA structure mandated under the current act. Dr. Chartock expressed support to keep MTEC as is right now.

Dr. Moore Johnson asked for a balance in the committee membership as some committees have many members and others have very few. Dr. Chartock requested comments from the board for any changes, additions or subtractions, to be made to the committee structure.

Dr. Wittstruck noted this as an opportunity to re-examine the mission, vision and values of the current committees. He suggested particular thought as to what is in the executive summary about whether or not MTEC would have a committee on the cross cutting agency for youth. Dr. Chartock assigned staff to send out a letter to that effect reflecting Dr. Wittstruck's comments.

In respect to the next meeting scheduled for July 29, 2005, there was a brief discussion of potential locations including Wentzville and Cape Girardeau. There was support for holding the meeting outside of Jefferson City but no consensus on the location.

Having no other business, Dr. Chartock declared the meeting to be adjourned.